REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated August 27, 2003. By way of this amendment, claims 1-10 have been canceled, and new claims 11-24 have been added. Claims 11-24 are currently pending in the application. Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 6-8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Rossmann. This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed in light of the present amendment.

New independent claim 11 recites a system for providing a directory of contact information for telecommunications devices, which includes means for interfacing with one or more telecommunications service provider stations to collect contact information therefrom and a central network station connected to the means for interfacing to receive the contact information. The central network station includes means for allowing access to the contact information. New independent claim 18 recites a method for providing a directory of contact information for telecommunications devices. The method includes using means for interfacing with one or more telecommunications service provider stations to collect contact information from one or more telecommunications service provider stations and providing access to the contact information via a central network station.

Rossmann discloses a system in which a two-way data communication device, such as a cellular telephone, pager or telephone, communicates with a server computer via a two-way data communication network. A user of the two-way data communication device is thus able to provide information to the server computer, retrieve information from the server computer, and provide data to an application on the server computer (see column 3, lines 45-50 of Rossmann). The embodiment of Figure 5 shows a

system in which messages from data communication devices 100, 101 and 102 are directed to an "airnet network translator" 500. As stated in lines 55-58 of column 19, the airnet network translator 500 transfers data between the two-way communication device and selected computer network.

Applicant respectfully submits that Rossmann fails to teach or suggest the claimed means for interfacing with one or more telecommunications service provider stations to collect contact information. Rossmann, which does not disclose any interfacing with telecommunications service providers, is primarily concerned with providing communication between users of two-way data communication devices and server computers. That is, Rossmann is concerned with allowing users of two-way communication devices to access server computers (presumably from remote locations). Rossmann does not address collecting and providing access to telecommunication contact information. While Rossmann does state at column 19, lines 65-67 that the airnet network translator 500 "can also provide a directory service to users," there is no description of how this is accomplished or how directory service information is collected. Rossmann simply does not disclose using a means for interfacing with one or more telecommunications service provider stations to collect contact information from the telecommunications service provider stations as required by independent claims 11 and 18. Rossmann also does not disclose how the information would be distributed.

For the above reasons, applicant respectfully submits that
Rossmann fails to anticipate new independent claims 11 and 18. Claims 12-17
and 19-24 depend from independent claim 11 or 18 and are thus believed to be
allowable for the reasons set forth above. Furthermore, at least some of these
dependent claims set forth limitations not met by the prior art. For instance, there
is no disclosure of using a router switch station as required by claims 12 and 19.
In addition, there is no showing polling telecommunications service provider

Serial No. 09/731,110

stations at selectable frequencies, as recited in claims 13 and 20, or one or more times per day, as recited in claims 14 and 21. The Examiner alleges that the Dreke et al reference suggest polling more than one time a day, but Dreke et al does not suggest polling to collect telecommunication contact information. Dreke et al also fails to overcome the above-mentioned deficiency of Rossmann of not disclosing means for interfacing with telecommunications service providers.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the objections and rejections is requested.

Allowance of claims 11-24 at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

12/29/03

Date

Patrick R. Scanlon

Reg. No. 34,500

207-791-1276